REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 72-82, 88, and 90 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Wang (US Pat. 5,778.766) in view of Matsushima (US Pat. 4,661,669) and Pond (US Pat. 2,085,169). Herein, Applicant amends independent claims 72 and 88 to make clear that the claimed rotisserie oven comprises an "exhaust vent", and amends independent claim 90 to make clear that the claimed rotisserie oven comprises a plurality of "exhaust vents". Dependent claims 73-78 are also amended for proper antecedent basis.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner indicates that Wang has "a vent located in the curved section", and directs the applicant to see figures 2 and 6 of Wang. In reviewing Wang, the applicant respectfully submits that Wang fails to show "an exhaust vent located in one of the walls of the enclosure", as recited in claim 72. For example, Figs. 2 and 6 of Wang have the following reference characters:

1. Housing;
2. Main body;
4. Front edge;
5. Rear wall;
5a. Top;
8. Access Door;
10. Pan;
20a. Front opening; and
22. Sloped axis.

None of the referenced structures are an "exhaust vent". In both Fig. 2 and Fig. 6, a set of parallel lines are positioned in the top (5a), but do not appear to have any opening from the heating cavity to the outside, and thus can not

operate as an "exhaust vent", either. Referring to Fig. 4 of Wang, there is shown a heating element 27 mounted on the housing 1, which has an oven cavity 20. *See also,* Wang, col. 3, lns. 50-65. This same arrangement is illustrated in Fig. 7, although Fig. 7 appears to show an additional outer cover. Applicant respectfully submits that Wang does not disclose an "exhaust vent" as claimed by applicant.

Matsushima does not overcome this deficiency of Wang, as Matsushima also fails to disclose an "exhaust vent" as claimed by the applicant. For example, louvers 22a and 22b are used to supply outside cooling air into the machine chamber 7, so are not "an exhaust vent". See Matsushima, col. 5, lns. 23-27. And louvers 38a and 38b are positioned in the "bottom plate" of the floor of the machine. As stated at col. 8, lns. 61, "... the provision of the louvers and the punching holes can reduce the resistance of air flowing through the machine chamber 7". Such a venting arrangement directly teaches away from the claimed invention. Instead of reducing resistance to air, as taught by Matsushima, the louver of the claimed invention "reduces potential heat damage to overhead cabinets..." because the "hot air must first rise above the louver and then exit by dropping down into the louver opening rather than simply rising directly through the louver opening". See Specification, pg. 36, lns. 21-28. Since Matsushima teaches away from such an indirect vented air path, there is no motivation to combine Wang and Matsushima.

For these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that Wang, Matsushima, and Prood, either alone or in combination, do not render claim 72 obvious. For similar reasons, the applicant also respectfully submits that Wang, Matsushima, and Prood, either alone or in combination, do not render claims 88 and 90 obvious.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes all pending claims 72-82, 88, and 90 are now in a condition for allowance. If the Examiner would find it useful, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Kolegraff
Reg. No. 41.125
3119 Turnberry Way
Jamul, CA 91935
Phone: 619-401-8008
Fax: 619-401-0808